arXiv:1402.3056v2 [math.PR] 16 Feb 2014

CONTINUITY OF IMPRECISE MARKOV CHAINS WITH RESPECT TO THE POINTWISE CONVERGENCE OF MONOTONE SEQUENCES OF GAMBLES

JASPER DE BOCK AND GERT DE COOMAN

ABSTRACT. The aim of these notes is to study the conditions under which the natural extension of an imprecise Markov chain is continuous with respect to the pointwise convergence of monotone—either non-decreasing or non-increasing—sequences of gambles that are n-measurable, with $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The framework in which we do this is that of the theory of random processes that is being developed in Ref. [1]. We find that for non-decreasing sequences, continuity is always guaranteed if the state space of the markov chain is finite. A similar result is obtained for non-increasing sequences, under the additional condition that the joint model is constructed using the Ville-Vovk-Shafer natural extension rather than the Williams natural extension. The extent to which these results apply to general random processes is discussed as well.

1. PRELIMINARIES

We consider an infinite horizon imprecise Markov chain of which the finite state space is denoted by $\mathscr{X}$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,[1] the random variable that corresponds to the state at time n is denoted by X_n and takes values in $\mathscr{X}$. We call any real-valued map on $\mathscr{X}$ a gamble. The set of all gambles on $\mathscr{X}$ is denoted by $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{X})$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the lower transition operator $\underline{T}_n \colon \mathscr{L}(\mathscr{X}) \to \mathscr{L}(\mathscr{X})$ provides us with the lower expectation $\underline{E}(f|x_1 \dots x_n) = \underline{E}(f|x_n) := \underline{T}_n(f)(x_n)$ of a gamble f on the next state X_{n+1} given the value x_n of the current state. For the first variable X_1, we have an initial model, in the form of a lower expectation functional—a lower envelope of expectation operators or, equivalently, a superlinear functional that dominates the infimum—$\underline{E}_1$ on $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{X})$. For every gamble f on X_1, the corresponding lower expectation is given by $\underline{E}_1(f)$.

A path ω is an infinite sequence of states $x_1 \dots x_n \dots \in \mathscr{X}^{\mathbb{N}}$. The possibility space Ω is the set of all paths. We denote by $\mathscr{L}(\Omega)$ the set of all gambles—real-valued[2] maps—on Ω. An initial sequence of states $x_1 \dots x_n \in \mathscr{X}^n$ is called a situation. We also allow for $n = 0$, which corresponds to the (abstract) initial situation $\Box$. Generic situations are denoted by s, in which case we denote its length by $\ell(s)$. For example: $\ell(\Box) = 0$ and, for $s = x_1 \dots x_n$, $\ell(s) = n$. For every $\omega = x_1 \dots x_n \dots \in \Omega$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we also consider the situation $\omega_n := x_1 \dots x_n$, with $\omega_0 = \Box$ as a special case. Furthermore, for every situation s, the cylinder set $\mathrm{cyl}(s) := \{\omega \in \Omega \colon \omega_{\ell(s)} = s\}$ is the set of all paths that have s as their initial segment. Note that $\mathrm{cyl}(\Box) = \Omega$. A gamble f on Ω is said to be n-measurable if $f(\omega) = f(\omega')$ for all $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$ such that $\omega_n = \omega'_n$ or, equivalently, if for all situations $s \in \mathscr{X}^n$, f is constant on $\mathrm{cyl}(s)$.

A process $\mathscr{F}$ is a function defined on all situations. If $\mathscr{F}$ is real-valued, we can associate with it, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, an n-measurable gamble $\mathscr{F}_n$ on Ω, defined for all $\omega \in \Omega$ by $\mathscr{F}_n(\omega) := \mathscr{F}(\omega_n)$. The limit superior of these gambles is denoted by $\limsup \mathscr{F}$. For all

[1] We use $\mathbb{N}$ to denote the set of all natural numbers (without zero); if zero is included, we write $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

[2] Gambles are often considered to be bounded as well; however, for the results in this note, such an assumption does not seem necessary.

$\omega \in \Omega$, we have that

$$\limsup \mathscr{F}(\omega) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathscr{F}_n(\omega) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathscr{F}(\omega_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{m\geq n} \mathscr{F}(\omega_n). \tag{1}$$

A process that maps situations to gambles on $\mathscr{X}$ is called a selection, and will be denoted by $\mathscr{S}$. With every such selection, we associate a real-valued process $\mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}$, defined recursively by

$$\mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(\square) := 0 \text{ and } \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(sx) := \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(s) + \mathscr{S}(s)(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathscr{X} \text{ and all situations } s.$$

Hence, for every $\omega = x_1 \ldots x_n \ldots \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we find that

$$\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega) = \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathscr{S}(\omega_{i-1})(x_i). \tag{2}$$

A selection $\mathscr{S}$ is called almost-desirable when

$$\underline{E}(\mathscr{S}(s)|s) \geq 0 \text{ for all situations } s.$$

In order for this to be well-defined for the initial situation $s = \square$, we introduce the notational convention that, for all gambles f on X_1, $\underline{E}(f|\square) := \underline{E}_1(f)$. The set of all almost-desirable selections is denoted by $\mathbb{S}$.

We now have all the terminology needed to define a joint model for our imprecise Markov chain, in the form of a lower expectation operator on $\mathscr{L}(\Omega)$. We consider two different options. For all gambles f on Ω, the Williams natural extension is

$$\underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f) := \sup\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \colon f - \alpha \geq \mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}} \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and } \mathscr{S} \in \mathbb{S}\} \tag{3}$$

and the Ville-Vovk-Shafer natural extension is

$$\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) := \sup\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \colon f - \alpha \geq \limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}} \text{ for some } \mathscr{S} \in \mathbb{S}\}. \tag{4}$$

Remark. *Both of these natural extensions can also be defined conditional on a situation s. The unconditional versions given above correspond to the special case $s = \square$. We do not consider conditional natural extensions in the present note because they overcomplicate the notation, thereby hiding the essence of the proofs of the results stated below. Nevertheless, all of the results below remain valid for these conditional natural extensions as well, simply because a conditional Markov chain can be identified with an unconditional one. It suffices to identify the new $\square$ with the conditioning situation s, to identify the new first random variable with $X_{\ell(s)+1}$, and to use $\underline{E}(\cdot|s)$ as the new initial model.*

Of the two natural extensions that were defined above, the Williams natural extension is the more conservative one.

Proposition 1. *For any $f \in \mathscr{L}(\Omega)$: $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f)$.*

Proof. Due to Eqs. (3) and (4), it clearly suffices to show that for any selection $\mathscr{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there is a selection $\mathscr{S}^*$ for which $\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}} = \limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}^*}$. So consider any $\mathscr{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $\mathscr{S}^*$ be defined as

$$\mathscr{S}^*(s) := \begin{cases} \mathscr{S}(s) & \text{if } \ell(s) < n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for all situations } s. \tag{5}$$

Consider now any $\omega = x_1 \ldots x_n \ldots \in \Omega$. Then for all $k \geq n$, we have that

$$\mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}^*}(\omega_k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathscr{S}^*(\omega_{i-1})(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathscr{S}(\omega_{i-1})(x_i) = \mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega),$$

where the first and third equality are due to Eq. (2), and the second equality is a consequence of Eq. (5) and the fact that $\ell(\omega_i) = i$. Hence, using Eq. (1), we find that

$$\limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}^*}(\omega) = \limsup_{k\to\infty} \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}^*}(\omega_k) = \mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega).$$

Since this holds for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we conclude that $\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}} = \limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}^*}$. □

For gambles that are n-measurable, with $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, both extensions coincide.

Proposition 2. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and any $f \in \mathscr{L}(\Omega)$ that is n-measurable: $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) = \underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f)$.*

Proof. Consider any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and any $f \in \mathscr{L}(\Omega)$ that is n-measurable. Then due to Proposition 1, we are left to prove that $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f)$ or, equivalently, that $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) - \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

So choose any $\varepsilon > 0$. Then due to Eq. (4), there is an almost-desirable selection $\mathscr{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $f - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) + \varepsilon \geq \limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}$. Consider now any $\omega \in \Omega$ and let $s_n := \omega_n$. Since $\mathscr{S}$ is almost-desirable, $\underline{E}(\mathscr{S}(s_n)|s_n) \geq 0$ and therefore, because $\underline{E}(\cdot|s_n)$ is a lower expectation operator, it is not possible for $\mathscr{S}(s_n)$ to be uniformly negative. Hence, there is an $x^*_{k+1} \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $\mathscr{S}(s_n)(x^*_{n+1}) \geq 0$. Now consider the situation $s_{n+1} := s_n x^*_{n+1}$. Then similarly, there is an $x^*_{n+2} \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $\mathscr{S}(s_{n+1})(x^*_{n+2}) \geq 0$. Continuing in this way, we construct a path[3] $\omega^* = s_n x^*_{n+1} x^*_{n+2} \ldots$ for which, for all $i \geq n$, $\mathscr{S}(\omega^*_i)(x^*_{i+1}) \geq 0$. Therefore, and due to Eq. (2), we find that, for all $m \geq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}_m(\omega^*) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathscr{S}(\omega^*_{i-1})(x^*_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathscr{S}(\omega^*_{i-1})(x^*_i) + \sum_{i=n+1}^{m} \mathscr{S}(\omega^*_{i-1})(x^*_i) \\ &\geq \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}_n(\omega^*) = \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega^*_n) = \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(s_n) = \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega_n) = \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}_n(\omega),\end{aligned}$$

and therefore also that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}_n(\omega) \leq \limsup_{m\to\infty} \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}_m(\omega^*) = \limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega^*) &\leq f(\omega^*) - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) + \varepsilon \\ &= f(\omega) - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) + \varepsilon, \qquad (6)\end{aligned}$$

In this last equation, the last inequality holds because $f - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) + \varepsilon \geq \limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}$. The final equality holds because f is n-measurable and because $\omega^*_n = s_n = \omega_n$. Since Eq. (6) is valid for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we infer that $\mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}_n \leq f - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) + \varepsilon$. Due to Eq. (3), this implies that $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) - \varepsilon$. □

2. Continuity with respect to non-decreasing sequences of gambles

Since the Williams and Ville-Vovk-Shafer natural extension coincide on n-measurable gambles, we can ask ourselves whether this holds for limits of n-measurable gambles as well. The following result establishes that for non-decreasing sequences of n-measurable gambles, this is indeed the case. Furthermore, both extensions are continuous with respect to the convergence of such a sequence.

Theorem 3. *Let f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, be any non-decreasing sequence of n-measurable gambles on Ω such that the pointwise limit $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n$ exists and is equal to some gamble $f \in \mathscr{L}(\Omega)$. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) = \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) = \underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f). \qquad (7)$$

Proof. The first equality in Eq. (7) is a direct consequence of Proposition 2. Since f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is non-decreasing, it holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ that $f_n \leq f$ and therefore also, using Eq. (3), that $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f_n) \leq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f)$. Hence, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f_n) \leq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f)$. By combining this with Proposition 1, we see that we are left to prove that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f)$.

Consider any $\varepsilon > 0$. Then due to Eq. (4), there is an almost-desirable selection $\mathscr{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $f - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) + \varepsilon/2 \geq \limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}$. Hence, due to Eq. (1), for all $\omega \in \Omega$:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(\omega) - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}_n(\omega)$$

[3] In doing so, we implicitly adopt the Axiom of Dependent Choice.

and therefore also

$$\begin{aligned}-\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f)+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\geq\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega)-\lim_{n\to\infty}f_n(\omega)&=\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega)-\liminf_{n\to\infty}f_n(\omega)\\&=\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega)+\limsup_{n\to\infty}\big[-f_n(\omega)\big]\\&\geq\limsup_{n\to\infty}\big[\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega)-f_n(\omega)\big],\end{aligned}$$

implying that there is an $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$ for which

$$-\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f)+\varepsilon\geq\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega)-f_n(\omega).$$

For any $\omega\in\Omega$, let $n^*(\omega)$ be the first index for which this is the case. Then for any $\omega'\in\mathrm{cyl}(\omega_{n^*(\omega)})$ and any $n\leq n^*(\omega)$, we have that $\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega)-f_n(\omega)=\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega')-f_n(\omega')$ because $\omega_n=\omega'_n$ and because $\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}}$ and f_n are both n-measurable. Hence, for any $\omega\in\Omega$ and any $\omega'\in\mathrm{cyl}(\omega_{n^*(\omega)})$:

$$n^*(\omega')=n^*(\omega).\tag{8}$$

For all $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$, we now define $C_n:=\{\omega\in\Omega\colon n^*(\omega)\geq n\}$. Then for all $n_1,n_2\in\mathbb{N}_0$ such that $n_1\leq n_2$, we have that $C_{n_1}\supseteq C_{n_2}$. Assume *ex absurdo* that, for all $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$, $C_n\neq\emptyset$, implying that $\sup_{\omega\in\Omega}n^*(\omega)=\infty$. Then we have that

$$\sup_{\omega\in\Omega}n^*(\omega)=\sup_{x\in\mathscr{X}}\sup_{\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(x)}n^*(\omega)=\infty$$

and therefore, since $\mathscr{X}$ is finite, there is an $x_1^*\in\mathscr{X}$ for which $\sup_{\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(x_1^*)}n^*(\omega)=\infty$. Similarly, we also have that

$$\sup_{\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(x_1^*)}n^*(\omega)=\sup_{x\in\mathscr{X}}\sup_{\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(x_1^*x)}n^*(\omega)=\infty.$$

Since $\mathscr{X}$ is finite, this implies that there is an $x_2^*\in\mathscr{X}$ for which $\sup_{\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(x_1^*x_2^*)}n^*(\omega)=\infty$. By continuing in this way, we construct a path[4] $\omega^*=x_1^*\ldots x_n^*\ldots$ for which, for all $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$:

$$\sup_{\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(x_1^*\ldots x_n^*)}n^*(\omega)=\sup_{\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(\omega_n^*)}n^*(\omega)=\infty.$$

However, due to Eq. (8), we also have that

$$\sup_{\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(\omega^*_{n^*(\omega^*)})}n^*(\omega)=\sup_{\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(\omega^*_{n^*(\omega^*)})}n^*(\omega^*)=n^*(\omega^*)\neq\infty.$$

Since this is a contradiction, we conclude that there is some $n^*\in\mathbb{N}_0$ for which $C_{n^*}=\emptyset$ and therefore also, for all $\omega\in\Omega$, $n^*(\omega)<n^*$.

Next, we consider the selection $\mathscr{S}^*\in\mathbb{S}$, defined as

$$\mathscr{S}^*(s):=\begin{cases}\mathscr{S}(s) & \text{if } n^*(\omega)>\ell(s) \text{ for all } \omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(s)\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}\quad\text{for all situations } s.\tag{9}$$

For any $\omega\in\Omega$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$, we have that $\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(\omega_n)$ and $\ell(\omega_n)=n$. Therefore, if $n\geq n^*(\omega)$, we infer from Eq. (9) that $\mathscr{S}^*(\omega_n)=0$. If $n<n^*(\omega)$, then for any $\omega'\in\mathrm{cyl}(\omega_n)$, we have that $n^*(\omega')>n=\ell(\omega_n)$. Indeed, assume *ex absurdo* that there is some $\omega'\in\mathrm{cyl}(\omega_n)$ for which $n^*(\omega')\leq n$. Then $\omega'_{n^*(\omega')}=\omega_{n^*(\omega')}$, implying that $\omega\in\mathrm{cyl}(\omega'_{n^*(\omega')})$ and therefore, by Eq. (8), that $n^*(\omega)=n^*(\omega')\leq n$. This is a contradiction. Using Eq. (9), we find that $\mathscr{S}^*(\omega_n)=\mathscr{S}(\omega_n)$. Hence, in summary:

$$\mathscr{S}^*(\omega_n)=\begin{cases}\mathscr{S}(\omega_n) & \text{if } n<n^*(\omega)\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}\quad\text{for all } \omega\in\Omega \text{ and } n\in\mathbb{N}_0.\tag{10}$$

[4]Again, we implicitly adopt the Axiom of Dependent Choice.

Consider now any $\omega = x_1 \dots x_n \dots \in \Omega$. Then for all $n \geq n^*$, we find that

$$\mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}^*}(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathscr{S}^*(\omega_{i-1})(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n^*(\omega)} \mathscr{S}(\omega_{i-1})(x_i) = \mathscr{F}_{n^*(\omega)}^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega),$$

where the first and third equality are due to Eq. (2), and the second equality is a consequence of Eq. (10) and the fact that $n^*(\omega) < n^*$. Hence, we also have that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathscr{F}_n^{\mathscr{S}^*}(\omega) = \mathscr{F}_{n^*(\omega)}^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega) \leq f_{n^*(\omega)}(\omega) - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) + \varepsilon \leq f_{n^*}(\omega) - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) + \varepsilon, \quad (11)$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of $n^*(\omega)$, and the second inequality is a consequence of the non-decreasing nature of the sequence f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and the fact that $n^*(\omega) < n^*$.

Since Eq. (11) holds for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we find that $\limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}^*} \leq f_{n^*} - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) + \varepsilon$, implying that $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_{n^*}) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) - \varepsilon$. Because f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is non-decreasing, we can infer from Eq. (4) that $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n)$ is non-decreasing as well. Therefore, $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_{n^*}) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) - \varepsilon$ implies that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) - \varepsilon$. Since this holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we finally obtain that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f)$. □

3. Continuity with respect to non-increasing sequences of gambles

The proof of the results in the previous section crucially hinges on the fact that f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is a non-decreasing sequence. For non-increasing sequences of n-measurable gambles, the Williams natural extension is not as well-behaved, as it is not necessarily continuous with respect to pointwise convergence of such sequences. However, for the Ville-Vovk-Shafer natural extension, results analogous to those in Theorem 3 can be obtained.

Theorem 4. *Let f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be any non-increasing sequence of n-measurable gambles on Ω such that the pointwise limit $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n$ exists and is equal to some gamble $f \in \mathscr{L}(\Omega)$. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) = \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{W}}(f). \quad (12)$$

Proof. The first equality in Eq. (12) is a direct consequence of Proposition 2 and the last inequality is due to Proposition 1. Since f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is non-increasing, it holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ that $f_n \geq f$ and therefore also, using Eq. (4), that $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f)$. Hence, we find that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) \geq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f)$, implying that we are left to prove that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) \leq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f)$.

Choose any $\varepsilon > 0$. Then due to Eq. (4), for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there is an almost-desirable selection $\mathscr{S}_n \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $f_n - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) + \varepsilon/2 \geq \limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_n}$.

Consider now any $k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $k \leq n$ and any $\omega \in \Omega$. Let $s_k := \omega_k$. Since $\mathscr{S}_n$ is almost-desirable, we can use an argument similar to the one used in the proof of Proposition 2 to construct a path $\omega^* = s_k x_{k+1}^* x_{k+2}^* \dots x_n^* \dots$ for which, for all $m \geq k$, $\mathscr{F}_m^{\mathscr{S}_n}(\omega^*) \geq \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_n}(\omega_k)$ and therefore also

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_n}(\omega_k) \leq \limsup_{m\to\infty} \mathscr{F}_m^{\mathscr{S}_n}(\omega^*) = \limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_n}(\omega^*) &\leq f_n(\omega^*) - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\ &\leq f_k(\omega^*) - \lim_{r\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_r) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\ &= f_k(\omega) - \lim_{r\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_r) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

In this last equation, the second inequality holds because $f_n - \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) + \varepsilon/2 \geq \limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_n}$. For the last inequality in Eq. (13), first recall that f_r, $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is non-increasing. Therefore, since $k \leq n$, we have that $f_k(\omega^*) \geq f_n(\omega^*)$. Due to Eq. (4), it also implies that, for all $r \geq n$, $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_r) \leq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n)$. Hence, $\lim_{r\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_r) \leq \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n)$. The final equality in Eq. (13) holds because f_k is k-measurable and because $\omega_k^* = s_k = \omega_k$.

Next, we consider a process $\mathscr{F}$, defined by

$$\mathscr{F}(s) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_n}(s) \text{ for all situations } s. \tag{14}$$

For any $\omega \in \Omega$ and any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we then have that

$$\mathscr{F}(\omega_k) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_n}(\omega_k) \leq f_k(\omega) - \lim_{r\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_r) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \tag{15}$$

where the inequality follows because, for all $n \geq k$, Eq. (13) holds. Using Eq. (15), we find that, for all $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup \mathscr{F}(\omega) = \limsup_{k\to\infty} \mathscr{F}(\omega_k) &\leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} f_k(\omega) - \lim_{r\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_r) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\ &= f(\omega) - \lim_{r\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_r) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2},\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because f_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, converges pointwise to f. Hence, we find that

$$\limsup \mathscr{F} \leq f - \lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{16}$$

We will now build a selection $\mathscr{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ by constructing, for every situation s, a gamble $\mathscr{S}(s)$ on $\mathscr{X}$ for which $\underline{E}(\mathscr{S}(s)|s) \geq 0$. So fix any situation s. Then due to Eq. (14), for all $x \in \mathscr{X}$, $\mathscr{F}(sx) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_n}(sx)$, implying that there is an $n_x(s) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ for which, for all $n \geq n_x(s)$, $\mathscr{F}(sx) \geq \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_n}(sx) - \nu(s)/2$, with $\nu(s) := \varepsilon 2^{-(\ell(s)+2)} > 0$. Since $\mathscr{X}$ is finite, we can define $n_{\max}(s) := \max_{x\in\mathscr{X}} n_x(s)$. Due to Eq. (14), we know that $\mathscr{F}(s) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_n}(s)$, implying that there is an $n^*(s) \geq n_{\max}(s)$ for which $\mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_{n^*(s)}}(s) \geq \mathscr{F}(s) - \nu(s)/2$. We now define $\mathscr{S}(s) := \mathscr{S}_{n^*(s)}(s)$. Since $\mathscr{S}_{n^*(s)}$ is almost-desirable, we have that $\underline{E}(\mathscr{S}(s)|s) \geq 0$. Hence, the selection $\mathscr{S}$ that is constructed in this way is almost-desirable: $\mathscr{S} \in \mathbb{S}$.

Consider now any $\omega = x_1 \ldots x_n \ldots \in \Omega$. Then for every $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{F}(\omega_{i+1}) - \mathscr{F}(\omega_i) &= \mathscr{F}(\omega_i x_{i+1}) - \mathscr{F}(\omega_i) \\ &\geq \Big[\mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_{n^*(\omega_i)}}(\omega_i x_{i+1}) - \frac{\nu(\omega_i)}{2}\Big] + \Big[-\mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_{n^*(\omega_i)}}(\omega_i) - \frac{\nu(\omega_i)}{2}\Big] \\ &= \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_{n^*(\omega_i)}}(\omega_i x_{i+1}) - \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}_{n^*(\omega_i)}}(\omega_i) - \nu(\omega_i) \\ &= \mathscr{S}_{n^*(\omega_i)}(\omega_i)(x_{i+1}) - \nu(\omega_i) = \mathscr{S}(\omega_i)(x_{i+1}) - \nu(\omega_i),\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds because $n^*(\omega_i) \geq n_{\max}(\omega_i) \geq n_{x_{i+1}}(\omega_i)$ and the next to last equality follows from Eq. (2). Therefore, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega_m) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathscr{S}(\omega_{i-1})(x_i) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \big[\mathscr{F}(\omega_i) - \mathscr{F}(\omega_{i-1}) + \nu(\omega_{i-1})\big] \\ &= \mathscr{F}(\omega_m) - \mathscr{F}(\omega_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \nu(\omega_{i-1}) \\ &= \mathscr{F}(\omega_m) - \mathscr{F}(\square) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \varepsilon \frac{1}{2^{\ell(\omega_{i-1})+2}} \\ &= \mathscr{F}(\omega_m) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \varepsilon \frac{1}{2^{(i-1)+2}} \\ &= \mathscr{F}(\omega_m) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{2^i} \leq \mathscr{F}(\omega_m) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2},\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is due to Eq. (2). As an immediate consequence, we find that

$$\limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega) = \limsup_{m\to\infty} \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}}(\omega_m) \leq \limsup_{m\to\infty} \mathscr{F}(\omega_m) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \limsup \mathscr{F}(\omega) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Since this holds for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we have that $\limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}} \leq \limsup \mathscr{F} + \varepsilon/2$ and therefore also, due to Eq. (16), that

$$\limsup \mathscr{F}^{\mathscr{S}} \leq f - \lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) + \varepsilon.$$

Hence, using Eq. (4), we find that $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n) - \varepsilon$. Since this holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we finally obtain that $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \underline{E}_{\mathrm{V}}(f_n)$. □

4. Do these results apply to more general random processes as well?

The results in this note were proved for—not necessarily stationary—Markov chains. However, as the reader may have noticed, none of our proofs have made use of the Markov property. The basic building blocks where the local models $\underline{E}(\cdot|s) = \underline{E}(\cdot|x_1 \ldots x_n)$. At no point was it necessary for these models to depend on x_n only, as is imposed by the Markov property. Hence, all of the results in this note remain true for random processes that are not Markovian. In fact, it is not even necessary for the graphical structure of Ω to be a complete $|\mathscr{X}|$-ary infinite tree. Any discrete event tree can be used, as long as each of its situations has a finite—possibly different—number of children. The use of almost-desirable selections is not necessary either, similar results can be obtained for desirable selections. However, a formal justification for these and other related claims falls beyond the scope of the present note; see Ref. [1] for more information.

Acknowledgements

The results in this note have benefited from discussions with Enrique Miranda, Matthias C. M. Troffaes and Arthur Van Camp.

References

[1] G. de Cooman, E. Miranda, and J. De Bock. A theory of random processes. Work in progress.

Ghent University, SYSTeMS Research Group, Technologiepark – Zwijnaarde 914, 9052 Zwijnaarde, Belgium

E-mail address: jasper.debock@ugent.be